



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/556,333	04/24/2000	David Stanard	3849US	7617

7590 07/11/2003
Gordon T Arnold
Arnold & Associates
2401 Fountainview
Suite 630
Houston, TX 77057

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/556,333

Applicant(s)

STANARD, DAVID

Examiner

Jamara A. Franklin

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of the amendment filed on 4/22/03. Claims 1-6 and 8-36 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 2 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

in claim 2, lines 6 and 8, delete "capable of";

in claim 5, line 6, "is capable of accessing" with --accesses--; and

in claim 5, line 8, "capable of generating" with --generates--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 8-12, and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berson (US 5,598,477).

Berson teaches a system for issuing airline tickets. A purchaser wishing to obtain an airline ticket inputs information through a personal computer 10 to data processing system 12-1. Data processing system 12-1 communicates with an airline reservation system to obtain

Art Unit: 2876

information as to the availability of suitable flights consistent with the purchaser's itinerary.

Data processing system 12-1 returns ticket information, including encrypted validating information, purchaser's name, destination, flight, and fare, to a local printing system 20. The local printing system is a non-intelligent printer operating under the control of personal computer 10 (col. 3, lines 21-60 and col. 4, lines 45-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-6 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber et al. (US 5,021,953) (hereinafter referred to as 'Webber') in view of Berson.

Webber teaches a system comprising a processor 18 which includes, or communicates with, a tariff file 20 for storing airline schedules, routings and footnotes, legal connecting times, and fares; a traveler file 22 for storing individual traveler's name and address and telephone numbers, credit card numbers, frequent traveler numbers, and seating preference; an airline reservation system 30 for storing seat availability; and a trip record for storing a traveler's itinerary and printing the itinerary and ticket at the traveler's personal computer (col. 5, line 22- col. 6, line 21; col. 17, lines 30-42).

Webber lacks the teaching of a unique indicia assigned to the ticket and ticket information in computer-readable form binding a particular seat to a particular customer. Also

Art Unit: 2876

not taught is the newly added limitation whereby the customer may print the ticket independent of ticket printing authorization from the ticket database.

The teachings of Berson have been discussed above.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that a unique indicia assigned to the ticket would have been beneficial for thwarting off fraudulent use of the ticket by making the pertinent ticket information available to only those in possession of instruments used to ascertain the indicia. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Webber with the cipher-code of Berson as a security means.

6. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay in view of Rosen (US 6,336,095).

Kay teaches a ticket having a cipher-coded bar code 33 located thereon representing ticket information including description of event, venue, and seat location (col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 3; col. 4, lines 29-46). The ticket may be printed using a standard PC assembly of a ticket purchaser (col. 2, lines 45-54).

Kay lacks the teaching whereby the ticket is useable by a ticket bearer without regard to the particular customer to which the particular seat is bound.

Rosen teaches a system wherein a ticket is purchased via a desktop owner and transferred to another party (col. 26, lines 1-7).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that the convenience of being able to transfer a ticket is beneficial since, in this manner, ownership of a ticket may change hands in the wake of an instance where the purchaser can not use the ticket. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2876

would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Kay with the transferable ticket as taught by Rosen to guarantee that the ticket will be put to use by someone.

7. Claims 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber/Berson as applied to claims 2 and 5 above, and further in view of Rosen.

Webber/Berson lack the teaching whereby the ticket is useable by a ticket bearer without regard to the particular customer to which the particular seat is bound.

The teachings of Rosen have been discussed above.

Again, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that the convenience of being able to transfer a ticket is beneficial since, in this manner, ownership of a ticket may change hands in the wake of an instance where the purchaser can not use the ticket. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Webber/Berson with the transferable ticket as taught by Rosen to guarantee that the ticket will be put to use by someone.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

New rejections have been applied to claims which include new limitations including,

Art Unit: 2876

“transmitting a ticket to a customer-selectable remote device independent of ticket printing authorization from the system for creating a ticket” and “the ticket is useable by a ticket bearer without regard to the particular customer to which the particular seat is bound”.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is 703-305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 730-308-4909. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2876

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jamara A. Franklin
Examiner
Art Unit 2876



JAF
June 17, 2003

DIANE I. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER